DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 676 SP 027 805

AUTHOR Stevenson, Robert B.
TITLE Staff Development for Effective Secondary Schools: A Synthesis of Research.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Madison.
PUB DATE May 85
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Educational Improvement; Institutional Characteristics; *School Effectiveness; Secondary Schools; *Staff Development

ABSTRACT

The question of how staff development can be structured to serve as a lever for school improvement is addressed by analyzing and synthesizing empirical studies that have reported an impact of staff development on significant characteristics of effective schools. The choice and conception of the term "staff development" is discussed, followed by the construction from the research literature of a taxonomy of critical dimensions of staff development. The resulting schema is employed in the synthesis of research by carrying out a form of configurative mapping to illuminate recurring trends and associations between staff development and effective school variables. A second analysis is concerned with reported constraints in targeting staff development toward the attainment, and maintenance, of the various characteristics of an effective school. Finally, the implications of these findings for research on staff development are discussed. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED339676

STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE SECONDARY SCHOOLS:

A SYNTHESIS OF RESEARCH

Robert B. Stevenson

Wisconsin Center for Education Research

May 1985

SP 027 805

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. B. Stevenson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In recent years an effective schools literature has emerged that attempts to systematically identify guiding characteristics for school improvement. The ultimate goal of this school improvement is to increase the academic achievement of all students. In fact the roots of the effective schools movement reside in issues of student equity: that is, a concern for improving academic achievement in schools with large populations of students disadvantaged through class or race.

In discussing the implications of the effective schools literature Purkey and Smith (1985) established a succinct and pragmatic connection between staff development and school effectiveness:

"School improvement can be helpfully conceptualized as a process of staff development directed toward implementing in a school those characteristics associated with school effectiveness" (p. 63).

This statement raises the question: How can staff development be structured to serve as a lever for school improvement? This paper addresses this question by analyzing and synthesizing empirical studies that have reported an impact of staff development on significant characteristics of effective schools (as identified by the effective schools literature). First, however, the choice and conception of the term "staff development" is discussed, followed by the construction from the research literature of a taxonomy of critical dimensions of staff development. The selected effective school characteristics then are related to and categorized with these critical dimensions. The resulting schema is employed in the synthesis of research by carrying out a form of configurative mapping to illuminate recurring trends and associations between staff development and effective school variables. A second analysis is concerned with reported constraints in targeting

staff development toward the attainment, and maintenance, of the various characteristics of an effective school. Finally, the implications of these findings for research on staff development are discussed.

The Conception of Staff Development

While "the continuing education of teachers," "inservice education," "professional development," and "staff development" often have been used as interchangeable terms in both schools and the literature, the choice of "staff development" is an important and deliberate one in this paper. Staff development has been defined as any systematic attempt to change the orientations (beliefs and attitudes) and practices of school personnel for an articulated purpose (Griffin, 1983a). This definition connotes a concern for galvanizing all the people employed in a school to working more effectively toward a common goal.

Although a function of professional development has been described as supporting schools to enact program improvements (Joyce, 1980), this term usually implies a focus on "the continuing development of the individual practitioner, usually the teacher" (Edelfelt, 1984, p. 100). Here the unstated assumption is that the development of an individual teacher's knowledge and skills, or revitalization of commitment, will improve his or her classroom effectiveness; and that by either a contagious process or the professional development of a sufficient number of teachers (whatever that might be), the total education (or achievement) of each student in a secondary school will be enhanced. There are at least three limitations to this approach, as far as improving the academic achievement of students is concerned. First, it fails to recognize that other professional and paraprofessional staff

(such as administrators, counselors, aides) affect students' success in school (Griffin, 1983a; Edelfelt, 1984). Second, the implementation of a new practice, especially a complex or radically different one, involves the teacher in the risk of (real or apparent) fumbling and creating a bad impression among colleagues: a situation which usually results in avoidance of any attempt at change or premature abandonment of the new practice (Little, 1984). Finally, by unilaterally addressing individuals it neglects the fact that changing a complex social institution involves more than amending individual parts (Arends et al, 1980; Edelfelt, 1984).

The label "inservice education" also tends to suffer from the first shortcoming. Additionally, it is usually used as a broader term for all forms of formal, professionally-oriented education for teachers who are assumed to have completed initial training and certification requirements. These teachers participate in inservice education for a variety of different reasons, and inservice programs, like preservice education, traditionally are focused on individual, rather than collective, goals.

While staff development, as conceived here, includes the professional growth of individuals, a collective purpose is essential for school improvement. Interestingly, Edelfelt (1984) has suggested that in practice staff development inevitably results in either professional development or school improvement, depending on whether the staff decides to concentrate on individual or school level development. Although there is the implication that these are mutually exclusive choices, he admitted that the broader context of school improvement has both "individual and collective purpose." Thus, definitionally we have

the beginning of a symbiotic relationship between individual and collective staff development and school improvement.

Critical Dimensions of Staff Development

Staff development has been found to comprise an eclectic collection of activities and programs that vary widely in function, source of initiation and responsibility, and practices of implementation (Goodlad, 1984; Lanier, 1984; Little, 1981; Moore & Hyde, 1981). These activities are so dispersed that many are invisible, with most school districts' administrators not perceiving them "as having any common staff development function" and being "unaware of the extent of teacher involvement" (Moore & Hyde, 1981, p. 107).

The complexity of such a situation has prompted the development of conceptual frameworks or schemes for classifying and examining staff development activities. For example, Joyce (1980) described four major systems that interact to form a structural model of inservice teacher education (ISTE): governance (i.e., decision-making structures), substance (i.e., context and process), delivery (including incentives and trainer-trainee relationships), and modes (i.e., forms of delivery). A "profile" of staff development developed by Fenstermacher and Berliner (1983) isolated four different organizational dimensions (each on a continuum): source of initiation (external or internal), purpose (compliance-remediation-enrichment), number of personnel involved (from all teachers to one teacher), and reason for participation (by mandate or free choice). Although both of these frameworks apparently have been constructed with reference to the research literature, the more focused definition of staff development adopted here and some more recent

research suggested a somewhat different taxonomy for examining the relationship to school effectiveness.

The frequently cited Rand Change Agent Study indicated that the originator of the idea or project was of no importance in determining teacher commitment to a change effort (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978). On the other hand, what was important to successful implementation and maintenance of new practices was whether teachers were involved in collaborative planning. Teacher participation, rather than teacher-initiation, in planning was the critical contributor to the development of 'a sense of ownership.' Admittedly, this study did not directly evaluate staff development but was concerned with the broader context of school change associated with various federally funded projects. However, a study that did focus on staff development (and school success) reported that teacher collaboration in staff development planning was an influential factor in a program's success and a school's effectiveness (Little, 1981). Little's conclusion that "the more collaborative the approach, the greater the influence" could be interpreted as implying teacher involvement in initiation produces a greater effect than collaboration which begins at a slightly later stage. Other studies, however, lend support to the insignificance of the source of initiation in comparison to the engagement and support of teachers in organizing staff development programs (Joyce, 1980; Lawrence, 1974; Lieberman & Miller, 1984).

Therefore, the notion of governance, in the form of "the decision-making structures which legitimize activities and govern them" (Joyce, 1980), is suggested as the first critical dimension of staff development. Although the above studies emphasize the advantages of

school staff governance, research on current practices suggest that other forms are probably more common. In examining the configuration of staff development in three school districts, Moore & Hyde (1981) observed marked differences in the control and organization of activities: school-based responsibility predominated in one district; district office control almost exclusively in a second, and a mixture in the third district which had the lowest level of activity. Variations also were found in the extent of participation among districts in programs sponsored by external agencies, such as university education departments. Unfortunately, these researchers were "unable to assess the quality of specific staff development activities." Four possibilities for governance of staff development can be identified: a collective school staff (teachers and administrators), school administration (only), school district central office, and an external agency (e.g., university graduate school, teacher association, or regional education agency).

The second proposed dimension concerns the process (and conditions) of program implementation. Obviously the governance structure is a significant factor in determining this process, but important additional variables are the forms of technical and personnel support and assistance (Hutson, 1981), and the role of the principal and other administrative staff (Cox, 1983). One would expect that the type of teaching-learning techniques employed in staff development programs would also be significant, but considerable dissent exists on this question. A meta-analysis of quantitative studies on the effects of in-service training programs indicated that observations of classroom practice, micro teaching, audio/video feedback sessions, and practice

are significantly more effective than other instructional techniques (Wade, 1984). This same study failed to support the conclusion of others (Joyce & Showers, 1981, 1982) that coaching, including peer-coaching (Showers, 1984), is a particularly effective method. It should be remembered, however, that most school effectiveness characteristics--other than the overall goal of academic achievement--are not easily measured in quantitative terms, and studies that recognize this problem by using qualitative approaches are excluded from meta-analysis. The failure to describe the specific teaching-learning techniques in many staff development studies suggests that either this variable is not considered significant or no particular techniques are used consistently, probably because they are contextually-specific: a position that, as explained later, applies to "delivery."

The third, and final, critical dimension for the taxonomy of staff development is purpose. Without a specific and shared purpose or "focus," collaborative staff development "turns out to be something of a fruitless exercise" (Little, 1981, p. 32). And further, staff development is influential when it provides: (a) an explicit set of aims of demonstrable relevance on which to work; (b) a degree of specificity and concreteness in language for discussion and ideas for translation into practice; and (c) a focus for promoting interactions among teachers and administrators in the course of their work (Little, 1981). The content or substance of staff development is closely related to the purpose, when described in this way, and therefore can be treated as part of this dimension rather than being delineated separately. This point is reinforced by the fact that the studies showing a relationship

between staff development and effective school characteristics represented a wide diversity in the actual content of the staff development programs. The implication of this observation is that the type of content is not a critical variable in identifying effective staff development.

The broad purposes of staff development have been categorized into three types: societal (e.g., responding to desegregation or integration issues), institutional or organizational (e.g., developing a common set of student expectations or revamping the organization of the curriculum), and instructional (e.g., improving students' "time on task") (Griffin, 1982). Arends, Hersh and Turner (1980) proposed a typology of four purposes, two of which concern school improvement and two relate to professional (but are labelled "staff") development--"keeping up with new knowledge and skills" and "lifelong learning and renewal." The first category is for locally derived problems and covers both instructional and organizational issues, while the second school improvement category applies to externally derived activities intended to solve problems that emerge from the large society (such as legislated career education or mainstreaming). Given the similarity of these typologies, the somewhat more discriminating Griffin scheme will be adopted here.

Classification of problems is essentially determined by the nature of the goals or problems to which a program is addressed. Societal goals tend to be political and raise issues of values and ultimately, power (Arends et al, 1980). Institutional goals involve social relationships and group and organizational dynamics, where contextual understanding and change is embedded in the perspectives of the actors.

Instructional goals, on the other hand, can be regarded as having a technical or training orientation, especially where goals are derived directly from research on teaching with the expectation that the function of staff development is to help teachers master new skills (Feiman, 1981). Thus, the three different purposes lead to either a political, social, or technical focus.

An explanation for omitting various other variables should be offered. Since both "mode" and "delivery" are highly context-dependent (related to purpose, content and situation) variables, comparisons of different systems are not particularly meaningful. Such decisions are more appropriately treated as part of the governance and process dimensions. This is not to deny the importance of variables such as incentives, but to suggest that they should be negotiated in the context of a governance system. Staff development for school effectiveness is a process involving whole school staffs (Courter & Ward, 1983), although for some instructional purposes in secondary schools, programs based on departments or cross-sectional representation may be more manageable and profitable (Purkey & Smith, 1985). Nevertheless, the issue on the number of personnel is not how many but what form of involvement--a process or governance decision. Similarly, the question of voluntary or mandatory participation should not be an issue: self-governance in the form of collaboration and collegiality cannot be mandated (Lieberman & Miller, 1984). When governance of staff development resides outside the school, then the reward system and incentives for participation (mandated being a negative reward) become significant. The more important questions, however, concern the means of motivation and support for establishing and sustaining a commitment to the goals of

school effectiveness. These questions will be discussed later. Finally, time--frequency and duration-- have been isolated as a critical consideration in designing staff development; but the only proposition offered seems self-evident: that the more opportunities teachers have for working on and trying out ideas, the more likely changes in classroom practice will result (Little, 1981).

Characteristics of Effective Schools

A recent synthesis of the effective schools research literature (Purkey & Smith, 1983) delineated four initial "process variables" that define school climate and culture, and nine "organizational and structural variables" that can be installed by administrative practices, as the elements constituting a model for an effective school. The model has been criticized for being predominately based on research in elementary schools, and lacking transferability to the more complex organization of secondary schools (Cuban, 1983). Purkey and Smith (1985) have partly denied this claim by indicating that only one of the literature sources for their model is based essentially on elementary school research. Nevertheless, while maintaining the applicability of the 13 elements and in particular the "cultural" characteristics, they acknowledge that some of the organizational characteristics are likely to be more problematic in secondary schools. In particular, elements that impinge on curriculum and teaching, such as "instructional leadership" and "curriculum articulation and organization," are more complex in secondary schools.

Although these last two characteristics might be somewhat elusive, they must be regarded as significant attributes capable of being influenced by staff development in a secondary school. As this paper is

concerned with these effective school characteristics on which school-focused staff development can have some impact, only five other variables identified by Purkey and Smith were selected. In addition to all four process variables of "collaborative planning and collegial relationships, sense of community, clear goals and high expectations commonly shared, and order and discipline," the three organizational variables of "instructional leadership," "curriculum articulation and organization," and "maximized learning time" were included. Besides "schoolwide staff development," which was itself one of the organizational variables, control of the remaining variables (such as "staff stability" and "district support") would appear to reside outside a school building and its staff, generally at the district office level.

Relationship of Effective School Characteristics to Dimensions of Staff Development

The seven effective school characteristics can be categorized within the three dimensions of staff development. Purkey and Smith's (1983) distinction between "process" and "organizational" variables did not lend itself to this task as only one of their process variables, in addition to one of their organizational variables, seemed applicable to the process by which staff development is implemented.

As already suggested, a number of research studies have identified "collaborative planning and collegial relationships" (which in turn can lead to "a sense of community" among a school staff who develop a shared language and reciprocally supportive relationship) as important features of successful staff development programs (Jacullo-Noto, 1984; Joyce, 1980; Little, 1981; Tikunoff, Ward & Griffin, 1979). "Instructional leadership" from the principal, not in the guise of an authority but as

a supportive and contributing member of the collegial collective, also has been found to be critical (Little, 1981). Significantly, except in most cases for the provision of technical assistance or classroom support (Cox, 1983; Elliott, 1978; Jacullo-Noto, 1984; Tikunoff, Ward & Griffin, 1979), no other particular strategies or incentives were necessary for improved practices to result. Issues of time, rewards, specific goals and procedures were negogiated as part of the collaborative process, with different resolutions in different contexts (Jacullo-Noto, 1984). In other words, the two effective school characteristics of collaborative planning and instructional leadership, supported by classroom and technical assistance, appear to represent sufficient conditions of an effective process for structuring staff development. Since the staff development activities studied in the above cited research covered instructional, institutional, and societal goals, these conditions can be assumed to apply irrespective of purpose.

The fostering of collaborative planning and collegial relationships can also be a specific goal or stated purpose of a program. This goal and the five remaining effective school characteristics can serve as the categories of specific goals (i.e., the purpose dimension) in the taxonomy. Others have similarly advocated deriving goals and content from the research on effective teaching (Griffin, 1983b; Vaughan, 1983). The six goals can be stated as follows:

- fostering collaborative planning and collegial relationships;
- promoting a sense of community,
- developing an explicit and commonly shared set of clear goals and high expectations of students;
- establishing a sense of order and discipline in the school;

. improving curriculum articulation and organization; and

. maximizing student learning time.

While school staff governance of staff development implies collaborative planning, a collaborative planning process does not necessarily imply collective staff governance. No other characteristic suggested itself as an obvious component of the governance dimension. Therefore in examining staff development studies it seemed worthwhile recording the type of governance structure, using the four categories described earlier.

Synthesis of Research

Numerous authors have lamented the lack of systematic empirical studies on staff development (Arends et al, 1980; Fenstermacher & Berliner, 1983; Griffin, 1982, 1983b; Hutson, 1981; Joyce, 1980; Moore & Hyde, 1981), with the situation, similar to school effectiveness research, exacerbated for secondary education. For this reason many reviews and commentaries on the literature have drawn on sources indirectly, rather than directly, related to staff development, such as organizational development and change, and effective teaching. A more optimistic but still cautionary note, however, has been sounded by Griffin (1983a) who claimed that recent research has provided "a hint of predictability" to staff development efforts, although he acknowledged the exploratory nature of these findings and the frequency of conceptual and methodological enigmas.

Given that over two years have elapsed since these last comments were written, during which staff development has continued to receive increased attention in the educational literature, it was surmised that

sufficient, rigorous studies now existed to enable a focus on staff development research (and the closely related areas of professional development and inservice education). The results still confirm the general paucity of empirical research but also indicate that Griffin's temperate words and caveats were well chosen.

A comprehensive review of the literature was beyond the scope of this study. Instead, major studies of school-focused staff development that satisfied the following criteria were identified:

(i) one or more of the seven effective school characteristics were reported as a specific outcome of a staff development program;

(ii) the purpose, governance and process of implementation of the program were described or could be inferred; and

(iii) the study appeared to be methodologically sound.

Preference was given to studies that, if not focused on, at least included high schools. Unfortunately, the literature often failed to distinguish between elementary and high schools, and no study meeting the above criteria conceptualized staff development as addressing the unique problems of high schools. And owing to a lack of studies in which shared goals and (high) expectations was an outcome, two reports of programs in elementary schools only were included.

Another serious problem was that much of the literature was weak on methodological details. The result was, that based on the information supplied, the reader frequently was unable to judge the validity of the claims and conclusions drawn by the authors. Other writers who have reviewed or cited some of these same studies apparently have assumed faith in the methodologies employed. Given this limitation, the findings of many studies have been taken at face value.

A summary of the synthesis of nine studies is provided in Table 1

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

This table is not intended to identify or imply the existence of simple process-product relationships, but to illuminate contextual configurations of staff development that appear to facilitate effective school characteristics. Two major themes are apparent: the relationship of staff governance and/or a collaborative planning process to the enhancement of collegiality; and the place and source of technical assistance in achieving effective school characteristics. A third but less distinctive issue is the role of instructional leadership in staff development for school improvement.

Collaborative Planning and Collegial Participation

The first four reports listed (Griffin, Lieberman & Noto, 1983; Joyce, 1980; Little, 1981; Tikunoff, Ward & Griffin, 1979), where governance resided with teachers (in the first and last case shared with external researchers through the use of an interactive research and development or action research model, and in the second case shared with members of the school's community), all proclaimed collaborative planning and decision-making as a key part of the implementation process (as would be expected) and increased collegiality as an outcome. Only one (Joyce, 1980) had such an outcome as a stated goal. In this case, the Urban/Rural School Development Program, which was aimed at involving school staff and community members equally and collaboratively in organizing staff development activities, from one to two years was

Table 1

Staff Development Studies and Effective School Characteristics

Study	PURPOSE/GOALS						Governance	PROCESSES INCLUDED			REPORTED OUTCOMES						
	Collab. Colleg.	Sense of Community	Shared Goals & Expecta-tions	Order & Discpl.	Curric. Art.	Learning Time		Collab. Planning	Instruct. Leader	Tech. Assist.	Colleg. Relat.	Sense of Community	Shared Goals & Expecta-tions	Order & Discpl.	Instruct. Leader	Curric. Art.	Learning Time
Jacullo-Nato (1984)				P			T	H		E,T	X			?			
Joyce (1980)	P						T	H		?	X						
Little (1981)							C→T	H	N	C,T	X				X	X	
Tikunoff et al (1979)						P	T	H		E,T	X						X
Romberg & Price (1983)					P	S	C	H-M		C,T	?		X(?)		X	X	X
Griffin et al (1984)				P		P	E→C	M-L		E,C				X			X
Showers (1984)	S						E	M		T	X						
Courter & Ward* (1983)			S			P	C	L	D	C,A			?		X		X
Parkay & Proller*(1985)		S	S				E	H-M		E,T	X	X	X(?)				

Key *elementary schools only

Governance & Source of Technical Assistance

T-teachers & administrators
A-administrators only
C-central district office
E-external agency

Purpose

P-primary
S-secondary

Collaborative Planning Process

H-high emphasis
M-moderate emphasis
L-low emphasis

Instructional Leadership

D-directive
N-nondirective

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

required to create parity in decision-making and to become effective. Rather than having a societal purpose, the primary goals in the other three cases were classroom instruction-oriented, being respectively: reducing disruptive behavior in the classroom; implementing mastery learning; and increasing student time on task. Another common outcome reported in these four studies was an enhanced sense of efficacy among the participants, both in relation to problem-solving and engaging and learning from peers. If this evidence only hints at the potential of self-governing staff development for revitalizing teachers, then the universal comment that "a new appreciation of the concept of teaching" (Jacullo-Noto, 1984) resulting from participating in the first (action research) program confirms this potential.

In reports where the governance of staff development was other than school staff, a clear relationship emerged. Provided that a high or moderate emphasis was placed on collaborative planning of the program, then collegial relationships were enhanced. Such programs were also the only ones in which institutional goals were attained, such as improved curriculum articulation and organization, and school climate or sense of community. A survey of research on staff development conducted over a decade ago reached an even broader conclusion: that courses where teachers were collaboratively involved in planning were more likely to accomplish their objectives (Lawrence, 1974).

Technical Assistance

An interesting difference, both within the staff governance programs and across all programs, was the use and source of technical assistance. The two action research models, of course, incorporated technical assistance from external researchers. This assistance has

been claimed to often be critical in dealing with complex teaching problems (Tikunoff et al, 1979): not in the sense of experts providing ready-made answers but in helping teachers grapple with "a well-conceptualized problem" (Griffin, 1983b). The Rand Change Agent Study similarly stressed the importance of "staff-support activities" in reporting that on-going classroom assistance resulted in teachers having a greater sense of efficacy (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978). These activities, however, included both the use of outside resource personnel and project meetings that "provided teachers with crucial collegial support in their efforts to change and grow" (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978, p. 86). Again good consultancy was characterized by assisting teachers solve problems for themselves, as well as furnishing concrete practical advice. Yet a cautionary note was added:

"Ironically, even 'good' consultants actually diminished project outcomes in some cases. Consultants often unintentionally preempted staff-learning opportunities and prevented teachers from learning to implement project strategies for themselves" (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978, p. 78).

While these authors interpreted this finding as indicating the fine line between offering too much and too little advice, others have viewed this problem as endemic to using external assistance. For example, Bentzen (1974) concluded that the I/D/E/A study supported the assumption that the solutions to a school's problems can be found within the school. This assumption was manifested in the "peer group strategy" which produced school (and staff) improvement. Even in this case, however, it was acknowledged that such a strategy enabled internal problem-solving, independent of external resource people, <u>most</u> of the

time. Thus the central issue remains, not whether external assistance has a place in staff development, but whether the locus of control of problem-solving and decision-making resides within the school staff.

A tentative generalization from some of the literature is that external assistance is more critical for institutional or organizational goals (Cox, 1983; Parkay & Proller, 1985), while collegial assistance in the form of peer support groups (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978; Putnam & Barnes, 1984) or peer coaching (Showers, 1983, 1984) is more effective for the purpose of implementing new instructional strategies (i.e., classroom content). Yet, two of the four studies (in Table 1) that reported achieving instructional goals (i.e., improvements in classroom discipline and student learning time) did not use collegial assistance in their implementation process (Courter & Ward, 1983; Griffin et al, 1984). Interestingly, however, these two studies failed to record any other outcomes, such as institutional improvements. By contrast, the outcomes of increased collegiality and shared goals and expectations were apparent in the other two studies where a collaborative group functioned as part of the staff development process (Tikunoff et al, 1979; Romberg & Price, 1983). The action research models might also seem to be exceptions to the generalization, but the external assisters tended to provide research input, rather than practical teaching content, to their collaborative group investigating an instructional issue.

Instructional Leadership

The form of instructional leadership of a principal or other influential staff member is a somewhat vexed question in the staff development literature. Little (1981) identified four types of

"critical practices" or patterns of interaction that distinguished school success in implementing mastery learning. Three of these practices involved administators and teachers observing each other work, planning and preparing materials together, and teaching each other about classroom practice. In other words, the meaning of "instructional leadership" in this study was not 'directing the troops' but being a collegial participant in staff development activities. In addition, principals were claimed to be able to promote the four critical practices (the fourth being teachers talking about practice), as well as "norms of collegiality and experimentation," by "announcing, enacting, sanctioning, and defending expectations for precisely those practices as central features of the work" in their school (Little, 1981, p. 24).

A different role for principals is evident when they are trained as a separate group to lead the implementation of a district office-planned program (Courter & Ward, 1983). This model apparently proved effective in achieving a specific instructional goal, the improvement of reading and mathematics scores by attending to student time on task. A similar, direct leadership role for building and district administrators was found successful in implementing various (unspecified) exemplary instructional practices when combined with training by a credible individual (preferably a peer) and continued classroom assistance (Crandall, 1983). Again, the tentative inference can be drawn that directive leadership can work for instructional improvement goals, but institutional improvement is a more complex undertaking. The later demands greater attention to organizational climate and dynamics where change can best be enacted in a collegial setting that encourages the

genuine concerns and understandings of the members of the organization to emerge.

Other Emergent Issues

Two other observations on the synthesis of research presented in Table 1 should be offered. First, the concept of "clear goals and high expectations commonly shared" (Purkey & Smith, 1983) is rather elusive and difficult to identify in terms of its presence or precise meaning as a goal or outcome in staff development reports. One meaning appeared to be merely the establishment of agreed goals for a staff development program, rather than the development of a common explicit philosophy of purpose for teachers and students. No study could confidently be assumed to have demonstrated the attainment of this characteristic, given the latter meaning. On the other hand, one school district has indicated that the introduction of quality circles contributed to the sense of shared purpose among special education staff at the secondary level (Bonner, 1982). The application of this Japanese industrial technique to schools, however, has been extremely limited and judgements about the contextual conditions in which it might be effective must await further trials.

Finally, the fostering of a sense of community in a school (as Table 1 indicates) is not generally viewed in staff development research as a characteristic warranting study or attention. Yet a sense of community has been described "as the glue that holds all the disparate parts of the school together and forges it into a coherent, successful organization" (Rossman, 1985, p. 22). While the development, as already reported, of collegial staff collectives suggests that community feelings are evolving, a sense of caring and concern must be extended to

all students before a school-wide community can be built. Staff development could have a significant role in promoting such a commitment by addressing the ways in which the school can involve students in cooperative and communal activities (Newmann & Kelly, 1983).

Some Obstacles to Effective Staff Development

Influential staff development programs require the participation of a "critical mass" of faculty, including the principal (Little, 1984). In secondary schools this critical mass, in some cases, might only be all the members of a department or an inter-departmental minority, dependent on the particular purpose. Nevertheless, collective governance and collaborative planning even among this number are inhibited by a number of structural features of secondary schools.

Beginning with their preservice education, teachers are socialized into a view of teaching as an individual, private activity rather than a collective, shared one (Lortie, 1975). Generally, prospective teachers complete individual study programs with few students sharing common causes (except in very small teacher preparation programs) and with limited opportunities for developing a collective occupational identity (Lanier, 1984). Even the inductive experiences of student and first year teaching tend to be regarded as individual challenges to be survived, not introductions to a feeling of collegial solidarity (Lanier, 1984). This situation can, in large part, be attributed to the social and physical organization of high schools. Individual teachers are physically isolated in separate classrooms where they have almost sacrosanct autonomy over what they do in their interactions with adolescents to whom they are confined for most of their working day.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Little (1981) discovered the likelihood of staff development being influential is greatest in schools where patterns of collegial interaction, relating to teaching practice, already prevail. In such schools, characterized as having "norms of collegiality" (shared work) and "experimentation" (analysis and evaluation of practice"), dialogue took place at any opportune time (e.g., over lunch) and location (e.g., teachers' lounge, corridors, faculty or department meetings), and access to colleagues' classrooms was open for observation and critique. The critical issue, however, is: How were the structural barriers to such interactions overcome in establishing these norms? Unfortunately, Little's (1981) study did not address this question. Spady (1984) implied that the major barrier was not structural but teachers' conceptualization of their work, with collegiality requiring a "paradigm shift." Other studies (Showers, 1983; Shultz & Yinger, 1982), however, have indicated that collaboration is not consistent with teachers' conditions of work, such as time and schedules. The central question then is: Can staff development programs which demand and support "collegial team work for implementation" (Little, 1984) eventually lead to a change in teachers' orientation?

Although, as previously mentioned, staff governance and collaboration cannot be mandated, there seems to be some evidence that certain conditions can induce active participation. Several strategies are suggested by Little's (1984) recent reflection on the implications of her earlier study. These are: explicitly inviting teachers to contribute knowledge from their observations of practice (and demonstrating that their contributions are valued); starting with a

focus on issues that are not too close to the classroom and hence perceived as less threatening (especially important in schools that don't have a tradition of successful team work); and careful negogiation from the beginning of purpose, role expectations and realities (of hard work and potential problems) facing the group. A sobering caveat has been added to this last strategy, based on experience in four schools: "no negogiation procedure, no matter how stringent, is sufficient to anticipate the actual time required, the actual dilemmas faced, the nature and pace of observable progress" (Little, 1984, p. 89). Problems or dilemmas to be overcome also have been identified for the first two strategies. The tendency of many teachers to be predominately concerned with practicality--often manifested in demands for or dependence on direct, concrete advice on what to do--may threaten attempts to engage in a critical analysis of current practices and may override a focus on guiding principles for creating an effective school (Lanier, 1984; Little, 1984). An inclination to avoid cognitive strain is exacerbated if the leaders of a staff development program maintain an avoidance-at-all-costs approach to any potentially threatening or conflict-inducing topics. Thus a fine line must be steered to ensure that substantive issues are critically examined without being perceived as so personally threatening that participants become disenfranchised.

The aging status of present high school teaching staff also has abetted the problem of eliciting active involvement in collaborative staff development. Long years of personal frustrations and limited rewards have resulted in habitual and unenthusiastic teaching (Sykes, 1983). These teachers tend to have lost their vitality for taking risks (Rossman, 1985), and are likely to hold skeptical attitudes toward staff

development and the prospects of bringing about change in a conservative institution. Nevertheless, two notes of optimism can be offered. First, teachers' negative attitudes toward staff development have been based on formal programs organized by district or building administrators" with little meaningful influence by teachers" (Lanier, 1984). Second, deprived of much adult interaction in their work, many teachers might welcome the opportunities provided by collaborative planning for communication with adults (Rossman, 1985).

These latter comments are not intended to suggest that collaborative staff development can produce long-term solutions to 'burn-out' and professional oppression. Emphasizing that collegiality and other forms of social support only help teachers cope with stress, Farber (1984) argued that changes in working conditions (including community-wide respect and support) are needed to actually prevent 'burn-out'. Further exploration of this issue is outside the scope of this paper.

However, conditions of practical support (such as time, resources, and staffing) are relevant to this discussion since they have been shown to most effectively maintain a commitment to collaborative work (Bird & Little, 1983). The principal is a crucial player in arranging these concrete forms of assistance, as well as providing less tangible moral support. The active "resource person" role of one (admittedly elementary) principal in Little's study included "rearrange schedules to permit joint work among teachers," "arrange release time for teachers" and "report relevant research to teachers" (Little, 1984, p. 94). Interestingly, this role evolved from a more passive, merely approving

stance over a period of five years. Additional leadership tactics that were identified as sustaining collegiality and school improvement were:

."announcing expectations for collegial and experimental work

.modeling collegial and experimental work

.sanctioning teachers' efforts

.defending and protecting new efforts against internal and external strain" (Little, 1984, p. 99)

Little (1984) noted two obstacles to such a role. First, principals are not traditionally selected, trained or rewarded for performing these functions. Second, given the size and curriculum complexity of a secondary school, the principal would need to delegate many of these tasks to heads of department and other influential teachers, to whom the first obstacle equally--if not more significantly--applies. In fact considering the orientation of high school teachers to personal, subject matter knowledge, the problem looms even larger.

A final comment should be made on a barrier that has been suggested as the cause of the earlier observation concerning the lack of attention in staff development to promoting a sense of community. In emphasizing that "successful schools bond people together and to the organization through a sense of concern," Rossman (1985) attributed the absence of personal caring for students in most high schools to the (tacit) view of students-as-products. This view, she argued, is reflected in the common stress on achievement in the effective schools literature. The implications for staff development are that this definition of students must first be explicated and then--as with the conception of teaching as autonomous and private work--changed.

References

Arends, R., Hersh, R., & Turner, J. Conditions for promoting effective staff development. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1980.

Bentzen, M. Changing schools: The magic feather principle. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Bird, T. D., & Little, J. W. Finding and founding peer coaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, 1983.

Bonner, J. S. Japanese quality circles: Can they work in education? Phi Delta Kappan, 1982, 63, 681.

Courter, R. L., & Ward, B. A. Staff development for school improvement. In Griffin, G. A. (Ed.), Staff development: Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Cox, P. Complementary roles in successful change. Educational Leadership, November 1983, 10-13.

Crandall, D. P. The teacher's role in school improvement. Educational Leadership, November 1983, 6-9.

Cuban, L. Effective schools: A friendly but cautionary note. Phi Delta Kappan, 1983, 64(10), 695-696.

Elliott, J. Developing hypotheses about classrooms from teachers' practical constructs: An account of the work of the Ford teaching project. Interchange, 1976, 7(2), 2-22.

Edelfelt, R. A. Inservice education: Moving from professional development to school improvement. Mimeo, 1984.

Farber, B. A. Teacher burnout: Assumptions, myths, and issues. Teachers College Record, 1984, 86(2), 321-337.

Feiman, S. Exploring connections between different kinds of educational research and different conceptions of inservice education. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1981, 14(2), 11-21.

Fenstermacher, G. D., & Berliner, D. C. A conceptual framework for the analysis of staff development. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, November 1983.

Goodlad, J. I. A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Griffin, G. A. Introduction: The work of staff development. In Griffin, G. A. (Ed.), Staff development: Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983a.

Griffin, G. A. Implications of research for staff development programs. Elementary School Journal, 1983b, 83, 414-225.

Griffin, G. A. Guidelines for improving teacher quality. American Education, November 1982, 33-37.

Griffin, G. A. et al. Changing teacher practice: executive summary of an experimental study. Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1984.

Hutson, H. M. Inservice best practices: The learning of general education. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1981, 14, 1-10.

Jacullo-Noto, J. Interactive research and development--partners in craft. Teachers College Record, 1984, 86(1), 208-222.

Joyce, B. R. The ecology of professional development. In Hoyle, H., & Megarry, J. (Eds.) World Yearbook of Education 1980: Professional development of teachers. London: Kogan Page, 1980.

Joyce, B. R., & Showers, B. K. The coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership, 1982, 40(1), 4-10.

Joyce, B. R., & Showers, B. K. Transfer of training: the contribution of coaching. Journal of Education, 1981, 163(2), 163-172.

Lanier, J. Research on teacher edition). In Wittrock, M. (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd education). New York: MacMillan, 1984.

Lawrence, G. Patterns of effective inservice education. Tallahassee, Fla.: State Department of Education, 1974.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. School improvement: Themes and variations. Teachers College Record, 1984, 86(1), 4-19.

Little, J. W. Seductive images and organizational realities in professional development. Teachers College Record, 1984, 86(1), 84-102.

Little, J. W. The power of organizational setting: School norms and staff development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, April 1981.

Lortie, D. C. Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

McLaughlin, M., & Marsh, D. Staff development and school change. Teachers College Record, 1978, 80, 69-74.

Moore, D., & Hyde, A. Making sense of staff development: An analysis of staff development programs and their costs in three urban districts. Chicago: Designs for Change, 1981.

Newmann, F. M., & Kelly, T. E. Human dignity and excellence in education: Guidelines for curriculum policy. Final report to the National Institute of Education. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, 1983.

Parkay, F. W., & Proller, N. Client-based staff development in urban schools: Problems and progress. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1985.

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. School reform: The district policy implications of the effective schools literature. Elementary School Journal, 1985, 85(5), 353-389.

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. Effective schools: A review. Elementary School Journal, 1983, 83(4), 427-452.

Putnam, J. G., & Barnes, H. Applications of classroom management research findings. Research Series No. 154. East Lansing, MI: The Institute for Research on Teaching, 1984.

Romberg, T. A., & Price, G. G. Curriculum implementation and staff development as cultural change. In Griffin, G. A. (Ed.) Staff development: Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Rossmann, G. B. Studying professional cultures in improving high schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1985.

Schultz, J., & Yinger, R. Developing inquiry skills in teachers: Some reflections on the improvement of practice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1982.

Showers, B. K. School improvement through staff development: The coaching of teaching. In Making our schools more effective: Proceedings of three state conferences. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1984.

Spady, W. S. Empowering the search for excellence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1984.

Sykes, G. Contradictions, ironies, and promises unfulfilled: A contemporary account of the status of teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 1983, 65(2), 87-93.

Tikunoff, W., Ward, B., & Griffin, G. Interactive research and development on teaching: Final report. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1979.

Vaughn, J. Using research on teaching, schools and change to help staff development make a difference. Journal of Staff Development, 4, 1983, 6-24.

Wade, R. What makes a difference in inservice teacher education? A meta-analysis of research. Educational Leadership, 1984, 42, 48-54.